

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE
8 COMMISSION,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11
12 SMALL BUSINESS CAPITAL CORP., et
13 al.,

14 Defendants.

15 Case No. [5:12-cv-03237 EJD](#)

16
17 **ORDER TERMINATING IN PART AND
18 DENYING IN PART MOTION FOR
19 RELIEF UNDER FEDERAL RULE OF
20 CIVIL PROCEDURE 60(B)**

21 Re: Dkt. Nos. 940, 973

22
23 This civil enforcement action was commenced by Plaintiff Securities and Exchange
24 Commission (“SEC”) on June 21, 2012, against Defendants Small Business Capital Corporation,
25 Mark Feathers (“Feathers”), Investors Prime Fund, LLC, and SBC Portfolio Fund, LLC. Presently
at issue is a motion filed by Feathers which primarily requests relief from this court’s summary
judgment determination pursuant Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). See Docket Item No.
940. The SEC has filed written opposition to the motion and Feathers has filed a reply. See
Docket Item Nos. 946, 947.

26
27 This court is unable to reach the merits of Feathers’ Rule 60(b) motion. Due to the
28 pending appeal,¹ the most the court can do is either indicate that it will “entertain” such a motion

29
30 ¹ Feathers has appealed from the summary judgment order and subsequent order granting relief to
31
32 Case No.: [5:12-cv-03237 EJD](#)

1 or indicate that it will grant such a motion. See Crateo, Inc. v. Intermark, Inc., 536 F.2d 862, 869
2 (9th Cir. 1976). The court will do neither at this time. Nor will it reopen discovery or award
3 attorney's fees since the court finds no justification for that type of relief under the circumstances.
4 Accordingly, the hearing scheduled for November 14, 2014, is VACATED. The motion is
5 TERMINATED as to the request under Rule 60(b) and is DENIED as to all other relief requested
6 therein. The related motion to compel (Docket Item No. 973) is also DENIED.

7 That said, the court notes that some of the arguments Feathers presented in this motion are
8 those the court has previously found unpersuasive or without merit. While the court certainly does
9 not wish to discourage the presentation of legitimate matters, Feathers is advised that it is
10 improper to continually raise rejected arguments. See Estate of Blas v. Winkler, 792 F.2d 858,
11 861 n.4 (9th Cir. 1986). Indeed, a variety of restrictions or sanctions can be imposed for that type
12 of conduct if the circumstances so require. Although the court does not suggest that Feathers has
13 engaged in anything sanctionable and is certainly not inviting anything in particular, it simply
14 wishes to indicate that the repetition of failed arguments is of no assistance to the decision-making
15 process. Feathers should take this instruction into consideration for any future filings.

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 Dated: November 10, 2014



18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

EDWARD J. DAVILA
United States District Judge

the SEC. See Docket Item No. 625 (Appeal number 13-17304).